

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	JING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/989,628	1	1/20/2001	Dwight Inman	64645-1054 3464	
27045	7590	09/03/2004	•	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON	INC.			TORRES, M	IARCOS L
6300 LEGA	CY DRIVE	E			
M/S EVR C11			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PLANO, TX	75024			2683	

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
Advisory Action	09/989,628	INMAN ET AL.						
,	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Marcos L Torres	2683						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 02 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.								
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]								
 a)	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.								
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:							
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);								
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);								
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or								
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.								
NOTE:								
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).								
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.								
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)								
10. Other:								

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments presented by the applicant were already considered on the final rejection. Regarding applicant argument's that Grace does not mention determining partial correlation. Grace discloses measuring the relation of two or more parameters to determine if they are related (see page 3, line 32 - page 5, line 13) that is the same function as partial correlation. Regarding applicant argument's that Grace it is only restricted to specific temporal windows. Grace discloses that preferably a temporal window is defined (see page 4, lines 28-30); the word preferably is not restricting to a temporal window. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., without the use of threshold value) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. The curren rejection in record stands.

WILLIAM TROST SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600